

Harvard and C.I.A. at Impasse Over Secret Work by the Faculty

By GENE I. MAEROFF

Special to The New York Times

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Aug. 3 — Harvard University and the Central Intelligence Agency, despite a year of negotiations, are at an impasse over the university's attempt to ban secret operations and recruiting by faculty members.

The disagreement, which has implications for all colleges and universities, centers on guidelines that Harvard adopted last year after disclosures about the C.I.A.'s campus activities.

The guidelines, which permit professors to work for the intelligence agency if it is done openly, also require that a Harvard person employed by the C.I.A. should not give the agency the name of another Harvard person as a potential recruit without the consent of that individual.

'Cloud' Over Academic Work

Derek C. Bok, president of Harvard, said that the failure of the intelligence agency to make certain guarantees to institutions of higher education "undermines the trust and quality of communications between professors and students" and "puts academic work abroad under a cloud."

Dale Peterson, a spokesman for the C.I.A., said in response that "basically what you have are two institutions — Harvard and the C.I.A. — with overlapping interests." He said that whatever the intelligence agency was doing at Harvard was "legal" and that he thought the disagreement had reached a point at which "it is up to Congress to arbitrate it."

Mr. Bok said in an interview that he had no way of knowing whether the intelligence agency was actively violating the university's new regulations against using faculty members for covert operations and recruiting. But he added that the agency's unwillingness to honor the ban made him "believe that they are doing it at some universities or they would not be so concerned about the rules we have set forth."

The conflict is highlighted in a series of letters exchanged by Mr. Bok and Adm. Stansfield Turner, the Director of Central

Intelligence. Copies of the correspondence have been made available to The New York Times.

"As it is," Admiral Turner wrote on May 15, "the restraints which we have already imposed on ourselves in this area have on occasion limited the capability of the intelligence community. Any further extension of the restrictions to effectively

Continued on Page 8, Column 3

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1978

Harvard and C.I.A. at an Impasse

Continued From Page 1

rule out the two types of activities in question is neither legally required nor is otherwise advisable in light of the potential obstacles which such actions would pose."

Admiral Turner says that he cannot "consider this agency bound by any set of procedures" in which Harvard "singles out the C.I.A." But Mr. Bok says that there is the question "of whether an agency of the Government can take it upon itself to simply disregard, in secret, the rules that a private institution has developed for itself."

In testimony on July 20 before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Mr. Bok implored Congress to "make it clear that these activities cannot continue and that the internal rules of academic institutions should be respected."

Correspondence Held Meaningful

According to Mr. Peterson, the C.I.A. spokesman, the correspondence between Mr. Bok and Admiral Turner is an accurate reflection of the C.I.A. point of view.

"The intelligence community is being singled out by Harvard's guidelines," Mr. Peterson said. "No such guidelines have been made to cover corporations or other organizations functioning on Harvard's campus. The bulk of our activities at Harvard and elsewhere are open. There are, however, some things done clandestinely and this is where the problem is. We try to use these activities in as limited a fashion as possible. But they aren't illegal and you can't arbitrarily rule them out."

"Our problem," he continued, "is that on campus there is a stigma when anyone deals with the intelligence organizations. But there are people willing to do it and if everyone who makes contact with us has to report it, our sources will dry up."

Mr. Bok said that he was particularly concerned about the possibility of professors, on behalf of the intelligence agency, recruiting as future spies foreign students who would be asked to work for the intelligence agency upon returning to their home countries.

Admiral Turner said: "Neither the C.I.A. nor the academics with whom it deals view the services rendered by them as a breach of professional ethics or otherwise underhanded or disloyal to the United States or its employer."

"Rather," he continued, "we consider these individuals to be acting wholly out of good faith and praiseworthy motives in

lending their assistance to our endeavors and doubt that they in any way compromise the integrity of the academic profession."

Mr. Bok said in the interview that he wanted to stress to the critics of Harvard's position that the university had not banned the C.I.A. from campus, but had "identified only certain forms of secret behavior which are incompatible with academic life."

"The guidelines leave a very wide scope for continued activities, particularly the normal type of consulting, research contracts and informal advice," he said. "We are, in fact, at the suggestion of Admiral Turner, running a program this summer of midcareer education for senior officers in the national security area."

reg: file
CIA relations
w/academic
institutions

CALL THIS TOLL-FREE NUMBER FOR HOME DELIVERY OF THE NEW YORK TIMES—800-631-2500. IN NEW JERSEY: 800-932-0300.—ADVT.